

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102; claims 1-6 and 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103; and claims 7 and 8 were objected to. Claim 1 is amended herein. No new matter has been entered thereby. Applicants believe the rejections are improper or have been overcome for at least the reasons below.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0100858 to Weber ("Weber"). Of the pending claims at issue, claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Although Applicants believe that the claim language adequately describes the relationship between the inner and outer walls of the hollow mold member, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the hollow body is a one-piece body.

Amended claim 1 recites a mold member for use in blow molding articles of plastics material. The mold member includes a hollow, one-piece body having an inner wall defining a mold cavity and an integral outer wall joined thereto to define a hollow interior between said inner wall and said outer wall; the outer wall defining therein an inlet port for admission of coolant fluid into said hollow interior and an outlet port for exhausting coolant fluid from said hollow interior; and the mold member being formed of nickel. Moreover, Applicants have amended paragraph [0007] of the specification to be consistent with the amendments made in claim 1. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at lines 6-13 of paragraph [0007] of the specification and in Fig. 8, where the hollow body is shown and described as being formed in a single vapor deposition step. Applicants respectfully submit that Weber is distinguishable from claim 1 for at least the reasons below.

Weber is generally directed to an encapsulation of metal heating/cooling lines using a double nickel vapor deposition process. Weber primarily focuses on a method of depositing a first nickel shell, attaching heating/cooling lines to the first nickel shell, and depositing a second nickel shell to encapsulate the heating/cooling lines. (See, Weber, Abstract). Therefore, Weber discloses a multiple-step manufacturing process and multiple-piece body, in contrast to the hollow one-piece mold member recited in claim 1.

Based on at least these reasons, Applicants believe that Weber is deficient with respect to the claimed invention as defined by amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and claims 2 and 4-6 that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Weber.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Rosato et al. (Blow Molding Handbook, pgs. 217-219 and 282-284) ("Rosato") and U.S. Patent No. 4,206,171 to Uhlig ("Uhlig"). Thus, the Patent Office primarily relies on Rosato and further relies on the Uhlig reference to remedy the deficiencies of Rosato. Of the pending claims at issue, claim 1 is the sole independent claim. As discussed above, amended claim 1 recites, at least in part, a mold member including a hollow, one-piece body having an inner wall defining a mold cavity and an integral outer wall joined thereto to define the hollow interior.


Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art is distinguishable from the claimed invention, even if properly combinable. For example, similar to Weber, the mold disclosed in the Rosato reference is made of separate mold pieces or components (i.e., a mold body and back plate) as illustrated in Fig. 7.1a-1. Also, as admitted on page 4 of the Office Action, Rosato does not disclose the mold being made of nickel. The Uhlig reference was merely relied on for the purported teaching of a blow mold 12 having a molding shell 20,23 made of nickel and a backing member 15,16 spaced from the shell by a cooling chamber 21. (See, Uhlig, Fig. 1 and Office Action, pg. 4). Moreover, Uhlig does not cure the deficiencies of Rosato as Uhlig similarly fails to disclose a hollow, one-piece body.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 1-6 and 9-20 be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Patricia K. Schmidt  
Reg. No. 46,446  
Customer No. 24573

Dated: January 5, 2006